

TAKTIČKE PRAKSE U PRISTUPIMA LOKALNIM KULTURNIM POLITIKAMA U ZAGREBU

-

DEA
VIDOVIĆ

-

STAVITI NA JAVNU RASPRAVU, SKUP IZLOŽBI
KUSTOSKOG TIMA WHW ODRŽAN U SKLOPU
PROJEKTA *OPERACIJA:GRAD* U PROSTORU BIVŠE
TVORNICE BADEL 8.–17. 9. 2005. SUDJELOVALI SU:
ARHIV NEVIDLJIVI ZAGREB, BORIS CVJETANOVIĆ,
NEMANJA CVIJANOVIĆ, VLATKO GILIĆ, SANJA
IVEKOVIĆ, MLADEN STILINOVIĆ, ŠKART. FOTOGRAFIJA
URBAN FESTIVAL.

„STAVITI NA JAVNU RASPRAVU“ (TO BE PUT UP FOR
A PUBLIC DEBATE) IS THE SET OF EXHIBITIONS BY
CURATORIAL COLLECTIVE WHW WHICH WAS HELD AS
PART OF „OPERACIJA: GRAD“ (OPERATION: CITY) IN
FORMER FACTORY OF BADEL 8TH – 17TH SEPTEMBER
2005. PARTICIPATED: ARHIV NEVIDLJIVI ZAGREB
(INVISIBLE ZAGREB ARCHIVES), BORIS CVJETANOVIĆ,
NEMANJA CVIJANOVIĆ, VLATKO GILIĆ, SANJA
IVEKOVIĆ, MLADEN STILINOVIĆ, ŠKART. PHOTO BY
URBAN FESTIVAL.

TACTICAL PRACTICES IN APPROACHING LOCAL CULTURAL POLICIES IN ZAGREB

-

Sociologu Sezginu Boyniku je, nakon dvotjednog rezidencijalnog boravka u sklopu programa Galerije Miroslav Kraljević 2006. godine, bilo evidentno da na zagrebačkoj nezavisnoj kulturnoj sceni¹ vladaju mreže. Tom prilikom je Boynik napisao: „Nije teško uočiti da je suvremena umjetnost i kulturna scena u Zagrebu dobro organizirana, pri čemu se svaka inicijativa, skupina, pokret, događaj, nevladina udruga, institucija (još uvijek je prerano dodati i Državu u ovaj makrokozmos) nalazi unutar jedne velike mreže. Ovo je barem neposredni utisak koji se stječe pri upoznavanju s kulturnom scenom Zagreba.“² Biserka Cvjetičanin je pak 2008. u dvotjedniku *Zarez*, predstavljajući dvije knjige, *Kultura, mediji*

i *civilno društvo* te *Kulturne politike odozdo*. *Nezavisna kultura i nove suradničke prakse u Hrvatskoj*, zaključila da je tim knjigama zajedničko „zalaganje za umrežavanje i nove suradničke prakse u Hrvatskoj“ te dodala da „civilno društvo promiče zajedničko djelovanje putem mreža kao suptilnog, fleksibilnog, tolerantnog i nehijerarhijskog načina povezivanja“.³

Da bi se objasnio ovaj fenomen zajedničkog umreženog djelovanja i insistiranja na civilnoj participaciji u donošenju odluka, nužno je sagledati teorijske, a onda i primjere iz prakse kulturnih i urbanih politika, ali i politika za mlade. Tek unutar iscrtanog konteksta mogu biti jasne i razumljive suradnje i zagovaračke



Having spent two weeks in Zagreb in 2006, in the framework of a Miroslav Kraljević Gallery programme, sociologist Sezgin Boynik was convinced that the independent cultural scene¹ of the town was ruled by networks. On that occasion, Boynik wrote: “It is not difficult to see that contemporary art and cultural scene in Zagreb are well organized, whereby each initiative, group, movement, event, non-governmental organization, or institution (it is still too early to include the state in this macro-cosmos) is a part of one huge network. That is at least the immediate impression that one gets when becoming acquainted with the cultural scene of Zagreb.”² And in 2008, while presenting two books in the biweekly

Zarez (*Culture, the Media, and the Civil Society* and *Cultural Policies from Below: Independent Culture and New Collaborative Practices in Croatia*), Biserka Cvjetičanin concluded that the element those two books had in common was “endorsing networking and new collaborative practices in Croatia,” adding that “the civil society promotes joint action through networks as a subtle, flexible, tolerant, and non-hierarchical mode of correlation.”³

In order to explain this phenomenon of joint action in networks and the insistence on civic participation in decision making, it is important to take a look at some theoretical and practical examples of cultural and urban policies, including those intended for young

aktivnosti zagrebačke nezavisne kulture koje su vodile prema ostvarenju pojedinih zajedničkih interesa ovog specifičnog polja kulture.

Suradničke platforme i taktičke mreže

Već iz naslova priloga *Working Together? The Second Life of the Collective*, koji su 2006. priredile organizacije okupljene oko platforme Zagreb – Kulturni kapital Evrope 3000⁴ za publikaciju *Leap into the City*, može se nazrijeti koliko je zajednički rad važan za zagrebačku nezavisnu kulturnu scenu. Organizacije, članice ove platforme, odgovarale su u prilogu na dva postavljena pitanja vezana uz pojmove mreža (*network*), grupa (*group*) i kolektiv (*collective*), opisujući tako svoja shvaćanja navedenih termina i razmatrajući njihovu važnost i ulogu. Najprecizniji opis suradnji koje se prakticiraju na zagrebačkoj sceni u polju kulturnih politika ponudio je Teodor Celakoski, uvodeći u raspravu koncept kolektivnih mreža i ističući da se za njih često upotrebljavaju termini poput „suradničke platforme“ i „taktičke mreže“. Kako bismo dobili jasan uvid u razvoj mreža i njihovu evoluciju te promjenu primarne uloge, potrebno je na trenutak zaustaviti se i pogledati kako su mreže nastale.

Prema Dragojeviću, „mrežno komuniciranje“ nastalo je kao reakcija na krizu s kraja 70-ih godina 20. stoljeća, koja je zahvatila

europske nacionalne kulturne politike.⁵ Odgovor na takvo stanje krize pronađen je u formiranju mreža. One su prvotno predstavljale komunikacijski kanal za svoje članice, kojima su omogućavale redovne susrete (konferencije, radionice, seminari itd.), putem kojih su one razmjenjivale ideje, znanja, vještine, iskustva te dogovarale zajedničke projekte, suradnje, razmjene programa i slično. Osim toga, mnoge od tih mreža imale su važnu reprezentacijsku ulogu, što znači da su upravo one svojim članicama osiguravale dodatni legitimitet i status. Razvoj tehnologija stvara novo društveno okruženje koje je Manuel Castells odredio kao „informacijsko doba“ i „umreženo društvo“.⁶ Ta nova paradigma stvara otvorene i fleksibilne društvene strukture koje osiguravaju veću participaciju. Posljedica je vidljiva u rastu broja mreža i činjenici da je sve veći broj građana uključen ne samo u jednu, nego čak istovremeno i u više mreža. Taj se trend naravno prenosi i u područje kulture i umjetnosti, gdje tijekom devedesetih godina dolazi do naglog rasta broja mreža, bilo onih koje djeluju međunarodno, ili pak na europskoj, regionalnoj, nacionalnoj ili lokalnoj razini, pa tako Dragojević upozorava na više od 400 različitih mreža u području kulture. Međutim, s vremenom se pokazalo da „komunikacijske“ i „reprezentacijske“ mreže nisu u mogućnosti zadovoljiti sve potrebe svojih članica te da njihova do tada primarna funkcija

people. It is only within that predefined context that one can clarify and understand those collaborations and promotional activities of independent culture in Zagreb that have resulted in the realization of certain common interests in this specific field of culture.

Collaboration Platforms and Strategic Networks

The very title of an article that organizations involved in Zagreb – Cultural Kapital of Europe 3000⁴ prepared in 2006 for the publication called *Leap into the City* – namely “Working Together? The Second Life of the Collective” – gives some clues as to the importance of joint work for the independent cultural scene of Zagreb. In their contributions, organizations that took part in the platform answered two questions linked to the notions of *network*, *group*, and *collective*, thus describing their understanding of these terms and reflecting on their role and significance. The most precise description of collaborations on the Zagreb scene in the field of cultural policies was offered by Teodor Celakoski, who introduced the concept of collective networks into the debate, emphasizing that they were often described in terms of “collaborative platforms” and “tactical networks.” In order to gain a clear insight into the evolution of networks and the change in their primary role, one should halt for a moment and take a look at the way they were created.

According to Dragojević, “network communication” developed as a reaction to the crisis of European national cultural policies in the late 1970s.⁵ An adequate response to that crisis was found in creating networks, which at first served as communication channels for their members, making it possible for them to meet on a regular basis (at conferences, workshops, seminars, etc.) in order to exchange ideas, knowledge, and experiences, or organize common projects, cooperations, and programme exchanges. Besides, many of these networks had an important representational role, since it was precisely them that guaranteed additional legitimacy and status to their members. The development of technology created a new social environment, which Manuel Castells has called “the information age” and “the network society.”⁶ That new paradigm created in turn open and flexible social structures, which guaranteed a higher degree of participation. A manifest consequence of that was the growth of networks and the fact that more and more people were involved not in a single network, but in several at once. That trend was naturally transferred into the field of culture and arts, where a boom of networks occurred in the 1990s, including international networks and those that were active on a European, national, or local level; thus, Dragojević has identified more than 400 different networks in the field of culture.

informiranja, komuniciranja i reprezentacije nije dovoljna za provođenje „mrežnih projekata“, smatra Dragojević.⁷ Kako bi se odgovorilo novim izazovima i potrebama te kako bi se u praksi počele provoditi i mrežno vođene zagovaračke aktivnosti, počinju se formirati, kako ih Dragojević naziva, „operativne mreže“, koje možemo odrediti i već spomenutim terminima kao što su „suradničke platforme“ i „taktičke mreže“, a za koje Celakoski navodi četiri ključne karakteristike. Prva se odnosi na aktivnosti temeljene na projektnom tipu, što znači da za njih nije primarna razmjena informacija i komunikacija, nego strukturno vođeni procesi određeni tematskim, proceduralnim ili nekim drugim interesima članica mreže. Slijedom takvog usmjerenja, druga karakteristika podrazumijeva usmjeravanje prema društvenoj i/ili političkoj agendi, dok se treća odnosi na interdisciplinarnost, odnosno povezivanje s drugim područjima izvan primarno kulturnog i umjetničkog djelovanja. Jasno je da takva uloga taktičkih mreža zahtijeva kompleksnu organizacijsku strukturu (četvrta karakteristika) koja će se temeljiti na „komunikacijskim i menadžerskim principima, regulacijama i protokolima“.⁸

Ponešto o karakteristikama taktičkih mreža

Kulturne politike su zasigurno najdinamičnije polje javnih politika. Činjenica da ministri kulture najčešće u svojoj ingerenciji „imaju

samo nekoliko ustanova kojima su izravno nadležni“⁹ dodatno objašnjava prethodnu tezu. Stoga kulturne politike jesu „čin balansiranja, ne toliko između različitih prioriteta kao što je slučaj u drugim javnim politikama, nego između različitih vizija o ulozi kulture u društvu“,¹⁰ a u procese donošenja odluka i njihovu implementaciju nužno je uključiti organizacije civilnoga društva. Uostalom, suvremeno društvo ne može više biti oslonjeno samo na državu i lokalne uprave te procese koji će biti vođeni odozgo, nego je potrebna aktivnija uloga građana i prihvaćanje odgovornosti kojom će se provoditi aktivnosti odozdo i time doprinijeti uspostavljanju „ravnoteže između individualne i kolektivne odgovornosti“.¹¹

Razvoj regija jačao je ulogu i važnost gradova, a samim time i lokalnih kulturnih politika. U zadnjih dvadeset godina na europskoj je razini, posebice kada je riječ o zemljama članicama Europske Unije, sve više rasla participacija građana i organizacija civilnoga društva u procesima *policy-makinga*. Omogućavanje njihova sudjelovanja jedna je od ključnih karakteristika razvijenih demokracija. Međutim, u kontekstima kulturnih politika koje ne pokazuju potpunu otvorenost prema organizacijama civilnoga društva mogući način borbe jesu taktičke intervencije. Opisujući prakse svakodnevnog života, de Certeau određuje taktike kao „prostor drugih“.¹² To je onaj tip društvenih praksi kojima primjena

TAKTIČKE
PRAKSE U
PRISTUPIMA
LOKALNIM
KULTURNIM
POLITIKAMA
U ZAGREBU

TACTICAL
PRACTICES IN
APPROACHING
LOCAL CULTURAL
POLICIES IN
ZAGREB

However, Dragojević has also indicated that, with time, it turned out that the “communicational” and “representational” networks were incapable of satisfying all needs of their members and that their hitherto primary function of informing, communicating, and representing was insufficient for realizing “network projects.”⁷ In order to cater for the new challenges and needs, as well as to engage in network-administered advocacy activities in practice, other networks started taking shape, which Dragojević has termed “operational networks” and which may be defined with the help of the aforementioned terminology as “collaborative platforms” and “tactical networks.” For these, Celakoski has listed four main characteristics. The first refers to the activities based on projects, meaning that they do not primarily engage in exchange of information and communication, but in structurally guided processes determined by thematic, procedural, or other interests of the network members. In line with this type of orientation, the second characteristic implies their focus on a social and/or political agenda, while the third refers to interdisciplinarity or connection to other fields, outside of the mostly cultural and artistic activity. It is clear that this role of tactical networks requires a complex organizational structure (their fourth characteristic) based on “communicational and managerial principles, regulations, and protocols.”⁸

More on the Characteristics of Tactical Networks

Cultural policies are doubtlessly the most dynamic field of public policies. The fact that ministers are often in charge of “only a few institutions that they directly control”⁹ offers an additional explanation of the aforementioned hypothesis. Thus, cultural policies are “an act of balancing between various visions of the role of culture in a given society, rather than between different priorities, as it is the case with other public policies,”¹⁰ while the processes of decision making and decision implementation necessarily include organizations of civil society. After all, modern society can no longer rely exclusively on national and local administrations, or on processes administered from above; it needs more active participation of its citizens and their accepting responsibility that will promote activities from below and help establish “a new balance between individual and collective responsibilities.”¹¹

Regional development has increased the importance of cities and assigned a more significant role to local cultural policies. At the European level, especially regarding the members of the European Union, citizen participation and organization of civil society has increased in the field of policy-making during the past twenty years. Offering people a possibility to participate is among the key characteristics of developed democracies.

taktika omogućava manevarske intervencije i akcije naspram subjekta, koji se nalazi na suprotnoj strani, koju de Certeau određuje i kao „neprijateljski teritorij“.¹³ Taktike nisu vezane uz prostor, nego uz vrijeme, i kao takve su trenutne i neponovljive. Radi se zapravo o svojevrsnom pružanju otpora vladajućim mehanizmima, s namjerom da se postignu određeni učinci, bilo da se radi o pukom opiranju uvriježenim praksama i modelima, ili ostvarenju specifičnih interesa onih koji posežu za takvim tipom intervencija koje će osigurati promjene dominantnog poretka. Takve prakse de Certeau nalazi u svakodnevnom životu, ali se intervencije ovoga tipa primjenjuju i u mnogim akcijama tzv. građanskog neposlušta. To su svojevrsna suprotstavljanja institucijama države kako bi ih se uznemirilo i potaknulo na reakciju i uvažavanje aktera na drugoj strani.

Usmjeravanje pažnje prema zagovaračkim aktivnostima, koje bi vodile ostvarivanju ciljeva i interesa okupljenih članica taktičke mreže, a tako i ostvarivanju vrlo konkretnih promjena, zahtijeva stratešku suradnju s drugim komplementarnim područjima i disciplinama koje imaju iste ili slične ciljeve. Takvim strateškim suradnjama sa sličnima osigurava se veća vidljivost i stvaraju se tzv. „kritične mase“, koje u javnosti mogu biti bolje prepoznate. Njihove su inicijative tako viđene i kao interes šire skupine zainteresiranih, a ne samo kao borba za ostvarivanje partikularnih

ciljeva nekog broja pojedinaca. Uostalom, suradnja više različitih područja omogućava i stvaranje šire argumentacije, koja će ponuditi nekoliko perspektiva. Takvo „udruživanje s drugima osnova je svakog daljnjeg djelovanja“.¹⁴ Međutim, prilikom uspostavljanja suradnji, bilo da se radi o partnerstvima unutar jednog područja/discipline ili umrežavanju dviju ili više njih, važno je, kako nas Višnić upozorava, da se okupljaju i povezuju oni subjekti i područja s kojima se dijele zajednički ili slični problemi i interesi, ali i isti sustav vrijednosti – kako kulturnih tako i političkih, društvenih i ekonomskih.

Za takva udruživanja u taktičke mreže nužno je osigurati transparentnu i prohodnu organizacijsku strukturu, koja će se temeljiti na komunikacijskim principima što koriste sve dostupne resurse i protokole, kako one u stvarnim/fizičkim prostorima tako i one u virtualnim prostorima. Budući da „grupa ne može sama od sebe funkcionirati“, ¹⁵ potrebno je uspostaviti svojevrsnu hijerarhiju odnosa. Najčešće su vođe upravo oni koji su inicirali suradnički proces, koji vješto uočavaju probleme i potrebe te ih artikuliraju u jasne misli i ideje i tako kontinuirano motiviraju sve okupljene. Premda možemo reći da se odgovornost dijeli podjednako među svim uključenima u proces, ipak je za praksu i provedbu aktivnosti nužno odrediti one koji će osigurati uspješnu i sigurnu provedbu intervencija i akcija, odnosno preuzeti odgovornost

However, in the context of those cultural policies that show themselves less than completely open towards the organizations of civil society, a possible way of struggle is through tactical interventions. When describing practices of everyday life, de Certeau has defined tactics as the space of the others.¹² It is that type of social practices in which applying tactics opens up space for manoeuvring interventions and actions towards the one on the opposite side, which de Certeau has also defined as the “enemy territory.”¹³ Tactics are linked to time rather than space, which makes them momentary and unrepeatable. They are actually an act of resistance against power mechanisms, with the purpose of achieving certain effects, be it mere rebellion against the traditional practices and models, or realizing the specific interests of those who resort to this type of interventions, bound to change the prevailing order. De Certeau has identified such practices in everyday life, but interventions of this type are also applicable to many actions that belong to the sphere of the so-called civic disobedience. It is a sort of countering the institutions of the state in order to disturb them and force them to react and to take into account the agents on the other side.

Drawing attention to advocacy activities that would lead to the realization of certain goals and interests of members united in a tactical network, thereby initiating change, requires strategic

cooperation with the other, complementary fields and disciplines that have identical or similar goals. Such strategic cooperation with peers ensures greater visibility and helps create the so-called “critical mass”, which can become more easily acknowledged by the public. Thus, such initiatives are also considered to be the interest of a larger group of those involved, rather than mere struggle for realizing the particular goals of a certain number of individuals. After all, cooperation between various fields makes it possible to develop a broader argument, which may open up new perspectives. Such “association with the others is a basis for all further activity.”¹⁴ However, when cooperation are established, regardless of whether they are partnerships within a single field/discipline or networks of two or more, it is important, as Višnić has indicated, that they should associate and include those subjects and fields with which one shares not only common or similar problems and interests, but also the same system of values – cultural as much as political, social, and economic. For establishing such tactical networks, it is indispensable to secure a transparent and permeable organizational structure that will be based on communicational principles using all available resources and protocols, both those in actual/physical spaces and those in virtual ones. Since a “group cannot function on its own,”¹⁵ it is necessary to establish a sort of hierarchy of

za operacionalizaciju zadataka. Tek s takvom organizacijskom logikom moguće je graditi i kontinuirano potvrđivati stečeno povjerenje između svih uključenih sudionika/članica mreže i u konačnici provoditi akcije koje će dati vidljive rezultate i voditi prema ostvarivanju zacrtanih ciljeva.

Borba za prostor. Slučaj Zagreb

U Zagrebu je velika koncentracija organizacija nezavisne kulturne scene. Prostor kao materijalna podloga kulture unutar kojega se iščitavaju vrijednosti društva ovdje će nam poslužiti kao mjesto na temelju kojega možemo pokazati poziciju i status ovoga kulturnog polja, ali i praksu njihova taktičkog umrežavanja. Kako to Laura Šakaja naglašava, „kulturne ustanove su odraz stavova i pogleda na kulturni razvoj glavnih društveno-političkih čimbenika-kreatora kulturne politike“.¹⁶ Već jednim pogledom na mapu kulturnih objekata grada Zagreba možemo primijetiti izostanak prostora za djelovanje nezavisne kulture.

U glavnom gradu zemlje tijekom devedesetih godina 20. stoljeća prostori koji bi promovirali nezavisnu, alternativnu i *underground* kulturu gotovo da ne postoje. Nekadašnji klubovi i prostori poput Lapidarija, Jabuke, Kulušića, Galerije SC zatvoreni su ili rade samo povremeno, a niti jedan od njih ne nudi preplitanje različitih umjetničkih izraza (koncerti, izložbe, filmske projekcije,

predstave, performansi itd.). Tako Zagreb na svojoj prostornoj mapi kulture nema mjesta za okupljanje mladih. Prepušteni ulici, mladi su samostalno počeli voditi brigu o kulturnoj i umjetničkoj ponudi, koju počinju sami proizvoditi. Tek s otvaranjem kluba Močvara, prvotno u Runjaninovo ulici a onda u tvornici Jedinstvo, u Zagrebu se pojavljuje prostor koji se temelji na heterogenom konceptu umjetničke i kulturne prakse, koja promovira drugačiju kulturu. Neposredno nakon toga otvaraju se net.kulturni klub mama te klub ATTACK!.

Međutim, ti prostori nisu bili dovoljni za produkciju i realizaciju kulturnih i umjetničkih programa brojnih nezavisnih organizacija kulture koje se javljaju od 2000. godine. Te su organizacije prisiljene na rad u vlastitim stanovima, u prostorima koje plaćaju po komercijalnoj cijeni ili povremeno koristeći terminski često nedostupne prostore javnih institucija kulture. Svoje programe realiziraju tako najčešće u javnim otvorenim prostorima, napuštenim i zaboravljenim prostorima te javnim kulturnim ustanovama. Kada su primorane ući u javne kulturne objekte, tada se suočavaju s nekoliko problema. Prije svega moraju osigurati novac za najam tih prostora. Ako financijski okvir to dopušta, onda je potrebno uskladiti slobodne termine koje institucija nudi s onim terminima koji su potrebni. U konačnici, zbog nedovoljnog broja slobodnih termina i skupe najamnine

TAKTIČKE
PRAKSE U
PRISTUPIMA
LOKALNIM
KULTURNIM
POLITIKAMA
U ZAGREBU

TACTICAL
PRACTICES IN
APPROACHING
LOCAL CULTURAL
POLICIES IN
ZAGREB

relations. Mostly the leaders will be those who have initiated the collaboration process, since they have ingeniously noticed the problems and needs, articulating them in clear thoughts and ideas, thus continuously motivating all those involved. Even though we might say that responsibility should be shared equally between all those who are joint in the process, it is still inevitable for practice and implementation to appoint those who will ensure that all interventions and actions are carried out successfully, that is, those will take responsibility for operationalizing tasks. It is only with such organizational logic that it is possible to build up and continuously reassert the trust existing between all the involved/members of the network and eventually carry out actions that will render visible results and lead towards the realization of the predefined goals.

Struggle for Space: The Case of Zagreb

In Zagreb, there is a dense concentration of organizations belonging to the independent cultural scene. Space as a material basis of culture, in which it is possible to interpret the values of the society, here serves as space within which we can show the position and status of the cultural field in question, as well as the practice of tactical networking. As Laura Šakaja has indicated, „cultural institutions are a reflection of attitudes and views on the cultural development of the main social and political factors –

those that create cultural policy.“¹⁶ A single glance onto the map of cultural venues in Zagreb will reveal the lack of spaces in which independent culture could act.

In the Croatian capital of the 1990s, there were almost no spaces that promoted independent, alternative, and underground culture. The previously existing clubs and venues such as Lapidarij, Jabuka, Kulušić, or SC Gallery were now all closed or opened their doors only occasionally, none of them offering any multi-artistic programmes (concerts, exhibitions, cinema, theatre, performances, etc.). Thus, Zagreb could not offer any space on its cultural map where young people could meet. Left on the street, they took the cultural and artistic offer into their hands and began producing it by themselves. It was only with the opening of Močvara, a club that was first situated in Runjaninova Street and then in the former factory of Jedinstvo, that Zagreb got a facility based on the heterogeneous concept of artistic and cultural practice that promoted a different type of culture. Soon afterwards, cultural clubs like net.kulturni klub mama and ATTACK! were opened. Nevertheless, these facilities are still insufficient for producing and realizing cultural and artistic programmes of numerous independent cultural organizations created after 2000. These organizations are forced to work in private apartments, in venues they must rent at the commercial price, or in the facilities of public cultural institutions,

organizacije nezavisne kulture često nisu u mogućnosti svoje programe realizirati više od nekoliko puta.

Anketa¹⁷ na temu prostornih potreba nezavisnih kulturnih organizacija koju je 2005. godine na uzorku od 65 organizacija provela Platforma 9,81 (u okviru projekta *Nevidljivi Zagreb*)¹⁸ i platforma POLICY_FORUM¹⁹ pokazuje da čak 34% organizacija nema svoj prostor. Od 66% organizacija koje koriste prostor, čak njih 43,2% unajmljuju prostor po tržišnoj cijeni, a za 60% njih prostor koji koriste nije adekvatan. Ti podaci jasno pokazuju da su organizacije nezavisne kulture bile (a i danas su) u teškoj poziciji s obzirom na nedostatak prostora za svoj rad, proizvodnju i prezentaciju sadržaja, što doprinosi njihovoj nestabilnosti, koja može dovesti čak i do propadanja pojedinih organizacija. Upravo zbog toga u proljeće 2005., pred zagrebačke lokalne izbore, organizacije nezavisne kulture u gradu Zagrebu započele su s nizom zagovaračkih aktivnosti koje se tiču prostorne problematike. Te aktivnosti su vodile platforma Zagreb – Kulturni kapital Evrope 3000, mreža Clulture²⁰ te klubovi ATTACK!, MAMA i Močvara. Oni ujedno, formirajući taktičku mrežu koja će voditi ostvarivanju njihovih ciljeva, uspostavljaju partnerstvo sa sektorom mladih, odnosno Mrežom mladih Hrvatske. To je taktičko partnerstvo pokrenuto zbog, kako je istaknula Višnić, „jačanja pozicije s ciljem ostvarivanja interesa i jedne i druge

zainteresirane strane, ali je ono i prirodna posljedica preklapanja u područjima djelovanja, ciljnim skupinama i načinima organiziranja, koji su već neko vrijeme organizacije nezavisne kulture i organizacije mladih upućivale jedne na druge.“²¹ S jedne strane, to je borba za osvajanje prostora, koji bi služio za njihov rad i prezentaciju kulturne i umjetničke produkcije te rada mladih, a s druge nastojanje da se obrane javni prostori koji su se našli na meti kapitala, koji je netransparentno vođen spregom privatnog i javnog sektora. Istovremeno, predstavnici ovog kulturnog polja su u partnerstvu s mladima nastojali osvojiti napuštene prostore kako bi dokinuli scenarij njihova sigurnog propadanja te im utisnuli kulturni i javni život s namjerom izmjene urbanog, ali i kulturnog pejzaža grada Zagreba. Njihova borba pokazuje da svjesnost o iskoristivosti praznih prostora i mogućnosti njihove prenamjene ne postoji kao strateški cilj u gradskoj administraciji. Suvremene prakse zagrebačke nezavisne kulture u suradnji s mladima razvile su tako kritičko preispitivanje prostorne problematike. Nezavisna kultura i mladi započeli su graditi platformu za različito, ponekad i suprotstavljeno mišljenje, što je omogućilo dijalog među različitim grupama sudionika, gradskim vlastima i medijima te vodilo prema ostvarivanju pojedinih ciljeva nezavisne kulture i mladih. Tako ta platforma pokazuje one društvene potrebe koje je Henri Lefebvre formulirao na sljedeći način: „međusobno

which they can use only sporadically and at inappropriate times. They often have to realize their programmes in open-air public spaces, in abandoned and neglected buildings, or in public cultural institutions. In this last instance, they often have to face a number of problems. First of all, they have to secure finances for renting them. If their budget allows for that, they have to coordinate the time slots that the institution is offering with their own needs. Eventually, because of the insufficient availability of these time slots and the high rent, independent cultural organizations are often unable to realize their programmes more than a few times. A survey¹⁷ on the topic of spatial needs of independent cultural organizations, which was carried out in 2005 by Platform 9,81 (as part of the project called *The Invisible Zagreb*)¹⁸ and POLICY_FORUM,¹⁹ on the sample consisting of 65 organizations, showed that as much as 34% of all organizations have no space of their own. Out of 66% organizations that need space for their work, as many as 43,2% must rent that space at the commercial price and 60% of them consider that space to be inadequate. These data show clearly that independent cultural organizations were (and still are) in a difficult position regarding the space they need in order to work, to produce and present their projects, which contributes to their instability and may in some cases even lead to their dissolution.

It is precisely for these reasons that in spring 2005, right before the local administration elections in Zagreb, independent cultural organizations launched a series of promotional activities concerning the problem of space. These activities were coordinated by platform Zagreb – Cultural Kapital of Europe 3000, Clulture network,²⁰ and clubs ATTACK!, MAMA, and Močvara. By establishing a tactical network that would enable them to reach their goals, they also entered a partnership relation with the youth sector, namely the Croatian Youth Network. The aim of that strategic partnership was, as Višnić has indicated, “to strengthen the position with the purpose of realizing the interests of both parties, as well as a natural consequence of overlapping between their fields of activity, target groups, and organizational modes, which had been drawing independent cultural organizations and youth organizations towards each other for some time.”²¹ On the one hand, it was a result of their struggle for conquering some space that would enable them to work and to present their cultural and artistic production, as well as the achievements of young people, while on the other hand, it was an attempt at defending those public spaces that had become the target of capital, untransparently administered through a fusion of private and public sectors. At the same time, the representatives of this cultural field were trying to conquer

suprotstavljene i komplementarne, one obuhvaćaju potrebu za sigurnošću i za otvaranjem, za izvjesnošću i pustolovinom, za organizacijom rada i organizacijom igre, potrebe za predvidljivošću i nepredviđenim, za jedinstvom i razlikom, za izdvajanjem i susretom, razmjenama i ulaganjima, neovisnošću (tj. za samoćom) i komunikacijom, za neposrednošću i dugoročnom perspektivom“.²²

Aktivnosti zagovaranja započele su nizom od tri javne tribine koje su okupile sve relevantne dionike (političare, nezavisne stručnjake i aktere nezavisne kulture i mladih) kulturnih i urbanih politika te politika za mlade, koji su iz različitih perspektiva ukazali na isti set problema. Taj proces javnog zagovaranja interesa nezavisne kulturne scene i scene mladih završio je *Deklaracijom o nezavisnoj kulturi i mladima u razvoju grada Zagreba* koja sadržava 9 mjera, među kojima je naveden i nedostatak prostora za djelovanje nezavisnih organizacija. Predstavnici nezavisne kulture i mladih ponudili su *Deklaraciju* političkim strankama na potpis, a gotovo sve političke opcije potpisale su je prije izbora. Svojim potpisom su se, ako pobijede na izborima, obvezale provoditi navedene mjere. Socijalna demokratska partija (SDP), politička opcija koja je preuzela vođenje Grada Zagreba, bila je jedna od potpisnica *Deklaracije*, što će se kasnije pokazati kao važna činjenica.

TAKTIČKE
PRAKSE U
PRISTUPIMA
LOKALNIM
KULTURNIM
POLITIKAMA
U ZAGREBU

TACTICAL
PRACTICES IN
APPROACHING
LOCAL CULTURAL
POLICIES IN
ZAGREB

those neglected spaces in partnership with youth organizations, with the aim of halting the process of their decay and of imbuing them with a new cultural and public life in order to change the urban and cultural landscape of Zagreb. Their struggle shows that the awareness of the usability of empty spaces and the possibility of their transformation did not exist as a strategic goal for the local administration. Thus, contemporary practices of the independent scene of Zagreb, in cooperation with the youth, managed to initiate a critical reflection on the problem of space. Independent cultural organizations and youth organizations began building up a platform for different, sometimes even opposed opinions, which made it possible for various groups of participants, the municipal authorities, and the media to enter a dialogue which led them towards realizing certain common goals of independent culture and youth. In this way, those social needs were revealed that Henri Lefebvre has formulated in the following way: "Opposed and complementary, they include the need for security and opening, the need for certainty and adventure, that of organization of work and of play, the needs for the predictable and the unpredictable, of similarity and difference, of isolation and encounter, exchange and investments, of independence (even solitude) and communication, of immediate and long-term prospects."²²

Upravo su zahvaljujući ovom dokumentu zagrebačke nezavisne organizacije ostvarile partnerstvo s Gradom Zagrebom, koje im je u rujnu 2005. omogućilo realizaciju manifestacije *Operacija:grad*²³ u tvorničkim kompleksima Badel-Gorica te staroj gradskoj klaonici Zagrepčanka, koji su u vlasništvu Grada Zagreba. Tijekom manifestacije *Operacija:grad* osnovan je Inicijativni odbor za Centar za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade koji je sastavljen od predstavnika klubova, platformi i mreža koje su pokrenule spomenuti javni proces zagovaranja. Odbor je zamišljen kao tijelo koje zagovara provedbu jedne od potpisanih mjera iz *Deklaracije*, točnije osnivanje Centra za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade grada Zagreba. Nakon uspješno realizirane manifestacije *Operacija:grad* organizacije nezavisne kulture su se povukle iz prostora, očekujući da će Grad Zagreb odgovoriti na njihove zahtjeve i potpisane mjere iz *Deklaracije*. Međutim, tvornički kompleks je nakon privremenog naseljavanja završio u rukama privatnih poduzetnika kojima je Grad Zagreb dao u najam te prostore, koje je manifestacija vratila u fokus javnosti. Osim toga, kako navodi Emina Višnić, „uslijedila je administrativna blokada koja je posljedica nedostatka političke volje i nefunkcioniranja gradske uprave“²⁴ te su sredinom 2006. organizacije koje su pokrenule akciju javnog zagovaranja i ponudile *Deklaraciju* na potpis

The advocacy activities began with a series of three public round tables, which included all the relevant parties (politicians, independent experts, and representatives of independent and youth culture), cultural and urban policies, and youth policies, who discussed the same set of problems from different perspectives. This process of public advocating the interests of independent cultural scene and youth scene ended with a *Declaration on Independent and Youth Culture in the Urban Development of Zagreb*, which contained nine measures and indicated, among other things, the lack of space for independent organizations. Representatives of independent and youth culture offered the *Declaration* for signature to all political parties and almost all of them signed it before the elections. Their signature obliged them, in case they won the elections, to carry out the indicated measures. The Social Democratic Party (SDP), which took over the administration of Zagreb, was among those who signed the *Declaration*, which proved an important fact in the time to follow. It was precisely owing to this document that the independent organizations of Zagreb entered into partnership with the city, which made it possible to realize the series of events entitled *Operation: City* in September 2005²³ at the former factory complexes of Badel-Gorica and the old municipal slaughterhouse of Zagrepčanka, all owned by the city. During the events of

osnovale Savez za centar za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade kako bi nastavile borbu za osnivanje i otvaranje Centra. Savez se zalagao za otvaranje mješovite ustanove čiji bi osnivači bili Grad Zagreb i organizacije mladih i nezavisne kulture okupljene oko Saveza. Također, od samih početaka Savez je inzistirao na Centru koji bi se smjestio na nekoliko lokacija, kako bi se izbjegla getoizacija nezavisne kulture i mladih njihovim smještanjem u jedan prostor, ali i odgovorilo na njihove raznolike potrebe (od edukacije, izvedbenih i glazbenih umjetnosti, informiranja, kulturnih događanja, do kvalitetnog i kreativnog ispunjavanja slobodnog vremena mladih).

Borba, zagovaranje i stalni pregovori između Grada Zagreba i Saveza za centar trajali su gotovo cijeli mandat zagrebačke vladajuće strukture (2005.–2009.) koja je pobijedila na lokalnim izborima u lipnju 2005. Ovom otezanju gradske administracije zasigurno je doprinijela i inicijativa Pravo na grad,²⁵ koja je sa svojim aktivnostima započela u ljeto 2006. kada otvara niz oštrih kritika zagrebačke gradske uprave i njezina čelnog čovjeka Milana Bandića. Inicijativa Pravo na grad je krajem 2006. uspostavila suradnju sa Zelenom akcijom kako bi zajedničkim snagama vodile borbu za javne prostore u gradu Zagrebu, a intenziviranje njihovih aktivnosti, kako je već istaknuto, sigurno je dodatno doprinijelo odugovlačenjima gradske administracije u pregovaranjima sa

Savezom za centar.

U proljeće 2007. Savez za centar organizirao je još jednu manifestaciju, *Operacija grad:Jedinstvo*, kada otvara privremeni ilegalni Centar za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade Jedinstvo. Ovaj simbolički naziv trebao je isprovocirati gradsku vlast i javnost upozoriti na neispunjavanje mjera iz Deklaracije te pokazati da nezavisne organizacije u nedostatku političke volje jedino mogu otvoriti ilegalni centar. Tvornica Jedinstvo je odabrana zbog jednostavne činjenice da je upravo u tom prostoru od 2000. godine smješten klub Močvara, a Udruženje za razvoj kulture koje vodi taj klub upravljalo je i velikom dvoranom Jedinstvo. Stoga predstavnici nezavisne kulture okupljeni oko Saveza za centar nisu morali okupirati i *skvotirati* niti jedan od postojećih napuštenih tvorničkih prostora, već su mogli legalno koristiti postojeće prostorne resurse kojima su neki od članova Saveza upravljali. Za razliku od prve manifestacije, *Operacija:grad*, koja je nakon privremenog naseljavanja tvorničkog kompleksa isti i napustila, ova druga, *Operacija grad:Jedinstvo*, nije imala namjeru izaći iz velike dvorane, nego u njoj kontinuirano nastaviti realizirati kulturne i umjetničke programe.

Nakon te manifestacije uslijedio je napad gradske uprave na klub Močvara, koji je rezultirao potpunim zatvaranjem kluba na više od godinu dana. Paralelno s tim sukobima Grad Zagreb je preuzeo

Operation: City, an Initiative Committee for the Centre for Independent and Youth Culture was established, consisting of the representatives of clubs, platforms, and networks that had launched the aforementioned process of public advocating. The committee was envisioned as a body that would promote the realization of one of the *Declaration* measures, namely the foundation of a Centre for Independent and Youth Culture Zagreb. After the events of *Operation: City* were successfully brought to an end, independent cultural organizations withdrew from the venue, expecting that the municipal authorities of Zagreb would answer their demands and carry out the measures defined in the *Declaration*. However, after a temporary settlement, the factory complexes ended in the hands of private entrepreneurs, who managed to rent these spaces from the municipal administration after the cultural events had brought them back into the centre of attention. As Emina Višnić has indicated, "it was followed by an administrative veto, which was a consequence of political unwillingness and the poor functioning of the municipal administration,"²⁴ so that in mid-2006, organizations that had launched the action of public advocating and offered the *Declaration* for signature, founded a Union for the Centre for Independent and Youth Culture in order to continue their struggle

for the foundation and opening of the Centre. The union endorsed the opening of a mixed-type institution, the founders of which would include the City of Zagreb on the one hand, and independent cultural and youth organizations, assembled in the Union, on the other. From the very outset, the Union was insisting on the Centre, which would occupy several localities in order to avoid the ghettoization of independent and youth culture, and also answer to their various needs (such as education, performing arts, music, information, cultural events, and structuring the free time of young people in meaningful and creative ways).

The struggle, advocacy, and continuous negotiations between the City of Zagreb and Union for the Centre lasted almost for the entire mandate (2005-2009) of the governing structures that won the local elections in June 2005. The procrastination of the municipal administration was certainly intensified by the initiative of Right to the City,²⁵ which began with its activities in summer 2006 in the form of sharp criticism against the municipal administration of Zagreb and its leading man, Milan Bandić. Late in 2006, the Right to the City initiative entered into collaboration with the Green Action in order to join forces in their common struggle for public spaces in Zagreb. Their intensified activities, as I have already pointed out, certainly contributed to the prolonged negotiations between the

dvoranu Jedinstvo s namjerom da je dodijeli samo jednom korisniku na upravljanje. Ta odluka je izazvala negodovanje nezavisne kulture i mladih, kojima je upravo ta dvorana obećana kao jedan od prostora Centra za nezavisnu kulturu, koji bi koristili svi, a ne samo jedan i povlašten korisnik. Ta događanja su dodatno usporila pregovore. Nakon gotovo četiri godine akcija konkretan dogovor o osnivanju Zagrebačkog centra za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade postignut je tek krajem 2008. godine, nekoliko mjeseci prije novih lokalnih izbora koji su najavljeni za svibanj 2009. godine. Ubrzo nakon što je krajem studenog 2008. zagrebačka Gradska skupština prihvatila prijedlog Poglavarstva o osnivanju ustanove, sredinom prosinca potpisan je Ugovor o osnivanju ustanove, koji su potpisali zagrebački gradonačelnik Milan Bandić i predsjednica Saveza Emina Višnić, ujedno i buduća ravnateljica ovog Centra. Iako je prilično jasno da vjerojatno do ovog osnivanja i potpisivanja ugovora ne bi ni došlo da se nisu blížili novi lokalni izbori (svibanj 2009.), za koje je trebalo izabrati svaki potencijalni glas, ipak se čini da je upornost i strpljivost nezavisnih organizacija kulture i mladih dovela barem do jednog pomaka, osnivanja Centra za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade.

I dalje taktike

Ovakvim nastojanjima nezavisna kultura i mladi pokazuju da

su sposobni provoditi ono što je još Henri Lefebvre predložio u svom članku *Pravo na grad*. Naime, u njemu je istaknuo važnost provođenja onih urbanih projekata koji nužno ne moraju biti ostvarivi. Tako Lefebvre kaže „neka se razvija imaginacija, ne imaginarno koje omogućuje bijeg i izbjegavanje, koje posreduje ideologije, nego imaginarno koje se ulaže u prisvajanje (vremena, prostora, fiziološkog života, žudnje)“.²⁶ Ovdje su umjetnost i kultura važne prakse koje mogu promišljati urbano koje će voditi „prema ostvariteljskom djelovanju“, gdje će se u konačnici dakle „maksimumu utopizma pridružiti optimum realizma“.²⁷ Dakako, upravo su aktivnosti nezavisne kulture i mladih u gradu Zagrebu pokazale da, usprkos nepostojanju jasnih kulturnih i urbanih politika, svi njeni ciljevi nisu neostvarivi. Iako su navedeni primjeri ponajviše uvjetovani političkim trenutkom, oni ipak nisu zanemarivi kao postignuća. Počevši od realizacije manifestacije *Operacija: grad* (iz 2005.), preko aktivnosti inicijative Prava na grad koje su usporile devastaciju Cvjetnog trga, osvajanja nekadašnje tvornice medikamenata Medika pa sve do osnivanja Centra za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade. Svi oni pokazuju da upornost i borba mogu biti djelatni, bez obzira na nespremnost političkih struktura da preuzmu odgovornost. Otvarajući pitanje rješavanja prostornih resursa nezavisna kulturna scena je pokazala svoju zrelost, ali istovremeno i nespremnost

TAKTIČKE
PRAKSE U
PRISTUPIMA
LOKALNIM
KULTURNIM
POLITIKAMA
U ZAGREBU

TACTICAL
PRACTICES IN
APPROACHING
LOCAL CULTURAL
POLICIES IN
ZAGREB

municipal administration and Union for the Centre. In spring 2007, Union for the Centre organized another series of events, called *Operation City: Jedinstvo*, and opened a *Temporary and Illegal Centre for Independent and Youth Culture Jedinstvo* (Jedinstvo means “unity” in Croatian, translator’s note). That symbolic name was meant to provoke the municipal administration and to draw attention to the fact that the *Declaration* measures had never been fulfilled, so the independent organizations, owing to the lack of political options, could only open an illegal centre. The factory of Jedinstvo was chosen merely for the fact that it had been housing Močvara club since 2000 and that the Culture Development Association, which was managing the club, was also in charge of the spacious hall of Jedinstvo. Therefore, the representatives of independent culture participating in the Union for the Centre did not have to occupy any of the derelict factory spaces as squatters; they could use the existing facilities legally, since some of those were managed by the Union members. Unlike the first *Operation: City*, which had abandoned the factory complex after a temporary occupation, *Operation City: Jedinstvo* had no intention of leaving the large hall; instead, it continued using it for its cultural and artistic programmes.

These events were followed by an attack of the municipal administration on Močvara, resulting in the complete closure of the club for more than a year. Parallel to these conflicts, the City of Zagreb took over the Jedinstvo hall with the intention of giving it to a single user for management. This decision caused indignation in independent cultural and youth circles, since they had been promised precisely this hall as one of the facilities of the future Centre for Independent Culture, with an idea that it could be used by everyone rather than a single, privileged user. These events additionally slowed down the negotiations. After almost four years of actions, an actual consensus about the foundation of the Centre for Independent and Youth Culture Zagreb was achieved only late in 2008, several months before the new local elections, which were announced for May 2009. Late in November 2008, soon after the Municipal Council of Zagreb accepted the proposal of its Head Office about founding the institution, in mid-December a Founding Contract was signed by Zagreb’s mayor Milan Bandić and the Head of the Association Emina Višnić, who also became the Centre’s manager. Even though it is perfectly evident that the contract would not have been signed had it not been for the approaching elections (May 2009), where all potential voters were important, it seems that

postojećih struktura kulturnih politika da ovo polje vidi kao strateškog partnera u budućem kulturnom razvoju grada. A da bi se osigurali uvjeti za stabilan kulturni razvoj Zagreba, koji bi uključivao i osiguravanje prostornih resursa, potrebna je strateški vođena kulturna politika. Izostanak strateški osmišljenih kulturnih, a onda i urbanih politika, koje se temelje na participaciji građana, pokazuje da gradska uprava nije u stanju kreativno promišljati Zagreb kao suvremeni grad.

Suodnošenje s ovim izazovima tek predstoji i to za obje strane. Nezavisna kultura će u budućem razvoju morati poduzeti nove taktičke korake i aktivnosti kojima će gradske strukture vlasti uvjeriti da su ravnopravan partner koji može sudjelovati u dugoročnom planiranju i doprinijeti kvalitetnijem razvoju kulturnog sustava i ponude. Istovremeno, gradska vlast će, ako želi pratiti dosege kulture europskih gradova, morati započeti strateški planirati i voditi kulturu grada te omogućiti participaciju svih zainteresiranih strana i građana. Tek će u takvom okruženju biti moguće graditi kulturu koja nije fragmentirana i opterećena pritiscima nejednakih uvjeta za sve.

¹ Nezavisnu kulturnu scenu čine samoosnovane organizacije civilnog društva koje djeluju u području kulture, a u hrvatskom društvu su se počele pojavljivati početkom 90-ih godina prošlog stoljeća. Iako slične

estetske, kulturološke, ideološke, političke i dr. vrijednosti možemo prepoznati i u pojedinim inicijativama, skupinama i radovima i ranijih godina 20. stoljeća, u formalnom smislu njihov početak je vezan uz promjene političkog sustava u zemlji i uvođenje Zakona o udrugama. (Hrvatska je među svim tranzicijskim zemljama imala najduži proces donošenja zakona kojim se regulira ljudsko pravo na slobodno udruživanje. Zakon je donesen tek 1997. da bi 2001. bio revidiran, kada je konačno ukinuto 16 neustavnih odredbi Zakona iz 1997.) Nezavisna kultura proizvodi one kulturne prakse koje su u zapadnoeuropskom društvu često vezane uz institucionalnu, *mainstream* i etabliranu kulturu, dok je u Hrvatskoj viđena kao alternativna kultura. Tijekom devedesetih uz ovu scenu su se vezivali raznovrsni termini, poput alternativna kultura, supkultura, urbana kultura, klupska kultura, kontrakultura i sl. Iako predstavnici ovog kulturnog polja sebe ne određuju najčešće upotrebljavanim terminom alternativna kultura, bez obzira na njihovu samopercepciju ovakvo terminološko određenje proizlazi iz odnosa kulturne politike prema ovoj sceni te joj tako mjesto određuju institucionalni kriteriji – financijski, infrastrukturni i drugi. Od početka 21. stoljeća najčešće se pak govori o nezavisnoj kulturnoj sceni, pri čemu su sami akteri te scene zaslužni za uvođenje tog termina i njegovu sve češću uporabu u javnosti. U ovom tekstu ćemo upotrebljavati termin nezavisna kulturna scena.

² Sezgin Boynik, „Sretni zajedno“, u: Minna Henriksson, Boynik Sezgin, *Zagrebačke bilješke*, Galerija Miroslav Kraljević, Zagreb, 2006. Izvor: www.g-mk.hr/program/Minna-L.-Henriksson:-Zagreba%C4%8Dke-bilje%C5%A1ke/193/ [14. ožujka 2010.]

³ Biserka Cvjetičanin, „Kultura i civilno društvo“, u: *Zarez*, 247/248, 2009., Druga strana d.o.o., Zagreb, Izvor: www.zarez.hr/pages/247/zariste1.html [14. ožujka 2010.]

⁴ Emina Višnić, *Nezavisna kultura i nove suradničke prakse u Hrvatskoj, Kulturne politike odozdo*, ECUMEST Association, European Cultural Foundation, Clulture Network, Amsterdam–Bukurešt–Zagreb, 2008., 31: „*Zagreb – Kulturni kapital Evrope 3000* je platforma za suradnju nastala kao zajednički projekt Centra za dramsku umjetnost

the persistence and patience of independent cultural and youth organizations managed to accomplish at least one shift – the foundation of the Centre for Independent and Youth Culture.

Further Strategies

With such enterprises, independent culture has shown that, in collaboration with youth organizations, it could realize what Henri Lefebvre has proposed in his article on *The Right to the City*. There, he has emphasized the importance of realizing those urban projects which needn't necessarily be feasible. Among other things, they should develop imagination: “not the imaginary of escape and evasion which conveys ideologies, but the imaginary which invests itself in *appropriation* (of time, space, physiological life and desire).”²⁶ In our case, art and culture are important practices, capable of reflecting on the urbanity that will lead towards “creative activity,” where eventually “the maximum of utopianism could unite with the optimum of realism.”²⁷

To be sure, it was precisely the activities of independent and youth culture in Zagreb that have shown that, despite the absence of clear cultural and urban policies, all their goals are not unfeasible. Even though the aforementioned examples have been largely determined by the political moment, they are far from negligible as achievements. Beginning with the realization of *Operation: City* (2005) to the activities of Right to the City, which

managed to slow down the devastation of the Flower Square, to the occupation of the abandoned Medika factory and the establishment of the Centre for Independent and Youth Culture – all these show that endurance and struggle can lead to results, regardless of the unwillingness of the political structures to take responsibility.

By raising the question of a distribution of spatial resources, independent cultural scene has demonstrated maturity and at the same time disclosed the unwillingness of the existing structures to see this field as its strategic partner for the future development of the city. And in order to secure the preconditions for a stable cultural development of Zagreb, which would include securing spatial resources, one needs a strategically guided cultural policy. The absence of strategically structured cultural and urban policies, based on civic participation, shows that the municipal administration is incapable of creatively envisioning Zagreb as a contemporary city.

Relating to these challenges is still a task to address, for both sides. In the future development, independent culture will have to undertake new tactical moves and activities, through which it can convince the municipal power structures that it should be considered an equal partner, capable of participating in long-term planning and contributing to the quality of cultural system and offer. At the same time, if the municipal administration wants

– CDU, Multimedijalnog instituta – mi2, Platforme 9,81 i Udruge za vizualnu kulturu Što, kako i za koga – WHW, kojima se kasnije pridružuju BLOK, Kontejner, Bacači Sjenki i Community Art. Projekt je pokrenut zajedno s njemačkim partnerom 'relations', a uz financijsku potporu Njemačke savezne zaklade za kulturu te Programa za umjetnost i civilno društvo Erste Bank grupe u centralnoj Europi 'Kontakt'.⁵

⁵ „Križa se prije svega odnosila na propitivanje i redefiniranje uloge javnih kulturnih institucija te sve većim naglascima na regionalnom razvoju, a posezanje za anglosaksonskim modelom 'kulturnog menadžementa' smatrano je 'spasonosnim rješenjem'“, smatra Dragojević. – Isto, 34.

⁶ Manuel Castells, *Informacijsko doba: Ekonomija, društvo i kultura, Uspori umreženog društva*, sv. 1, Golden Marketing, Zagreb, 2000.

⁷ Bilj. 4, 34.

⁸ Katrin Klingan, Ines Kappert (ur.), *Leap into the City*, DuMont Literatur und Kunst Verlag, Cologne, 2006., 397.

⁹ Zrinjka Peruško (ur.), *Mediji, kultura i civilno društvo*, Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb, 2008., 107.

¹⁰ Isto.

¹¹ Anthony Giddens, *Treći put. Obnova socijaldemokracije*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 1999., 43.

¹² Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1998., 54.

¹³ Isto.

¹⁴ Bilj. 4, 47.

¹⁵ Bilj. 4, 48.

¹⁶ Laura Sakaja, *Kultura i prostor, Prostorna organizacija kulturnih djelatnosti u Hrvatskoj*, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Zagreb, 1999., 10.

¹⁷ Podaci provedenog istraživanja koji su objavljeni u tekstu Marka Sančanina „Centralni zagrebački kulturni klaster: logika prostornog razvoja kulture“ (u knjizi: Sanjin Dragojević i Tihomir Žiljak (ur.), *Organizacijski razvoj i strateško planiranje u kulturi: Grad Zagreb*, Zagreb, 2008., 262–278), ne donose nikakvu dodatnu interpretaciju.

¹⁸ Projekt Nevidljivi Zagreb je 2003. godine pokrenula udruga Platforma

9,81 s ciljem da gradski prostori (tvornički prostori, podvožnjaci, pothodnici, tuneli itd.) koji su izgubili svoju primarnu funkciju i koje su urbane politike zanemarile postanu prostori za eksperimentiranje s novim tipologijama javnog prostora. Temeljna ideja tog projekta bila je privremena upotreba tih zanemarenih prostora u različitim kulturnim programima kako bi se premostila praznina u tranzicijskom procesu te potaknule vizije razvoja u odnosu na specifičnost svake lokacije.

¹⁹ Bilj. 4, 28: „POLICY_FORUM je platforma koja okuplja istaknute organizacije i pojedince koji djeluju u području nezavisne kulture i/ili su zainteresirani za kreiranje novih razvojnih modela kulturnih politika. POLICY_FORUM je neformalna, dinamična, 'plutajuća' platforma. Djeluje kao grupa koja se povremeno okuplja kako bi pratila javne politike koje se odnose na razvoj nezavisne kulture na nacionalnoj i lokalnoj razini te koja zagovara promjene u relevantnom institucionalnom okviru, kako u praksama provedbe tako i legislative. Grupa okupljena oko POLICY_FORUMA promjenjiva je u svojem broju i strukturi, s obzirom na trenutne teme kojima se bavi te se tako veže i uz različite subjekte (mreža Clubture, suradnička platforma Zagreb – Kulturni kapital Evrope 3000, inicijativa Pravo na grad, pojedine organizacije itd.), odnosno 'pluta' između njih.“

²⁰ Bilj. 4, 19: „Clubture je neprofitna, inkluzivna, participativna mreža organizacija, koja radi na osnaživanju nezavisnog kulturnog sektora kroz programsko povezivanje, podizanje javne vidljivosti, poticanje organizacijskog razvoja sektora te jačanja njegova utjecaja na promjenu institucionalnog okvira u kojem djeluje.“

²¹ Bilj. 4, 48.

²² Henri Lefebvre, „Pravo na grad“, u: Kovačević, L. (ur.) et al, *Operacija:grad. Priručnik za život u neoliberalnoj stvarnosti*, Savez za centar za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade, Multimedijalni institut, Platforma 9,81 – Institut za istraživanja u arhitekturi, BLOK – Lokalna baza za osvajavanje kulture, SU Klubtura, Zagreb, 2008., 17.

²³ Manifestacija Operacija:grad rezultat je suradnje većine zagrebačkih nezavisnih organizacija (u kreaciji manifestacije sudjelovalo je 27 organizacija), a imala je za cilj pokazati potrebe tih organizacija za

TAKTIČKE
PRAKSE U
PRISTUPIMA
LOKALNIM
KULTURNIM
POLITIKAMA
U ZAGREBU

TACTICAL
PRACTICES IN
APPROACHING
LOCAL CULTURAL
POLICIES IN
ZAGREB

to keep up with the cultural level of other European cities, it will have to engage in strategic planning and implementing of urban culture, making it possible for all willing parties and citizens to participate. It is only in such environment, which is not fragmented or burdened with pressures of unequal conditions, that it will be possible to build up culture.

¹ Independent cultural scene consist of self-established organizations of civil society active in the field of culture, which started emerging in the Croatian society in the early 1990s. Even though we might recognize similar aesthetical, cultural, ideological, political etc. values in certain initiatives, groups, and activities from the earlier years of the 20th century, formally speaking their emergence is linked to the political changes in the country and the enactment of the Associations Act. (Among the transition countries, Croatia has had the longest process of passing a law that would regulate the human right of free association. It occurred only in 1997, and in 2001 the law was revised, whereby the 16 unconstitutional regulations of the 1997 Act were finally abolished.) Independent culture produces those cultural practices that are in Western European societies often linked to the institutional, mainstream, and well-established culture, whereas in Croatia they are viewed as alternative culture. In the 1990s, various terms were associated with this cultural scene, such as alternative culture, subculture, urban culture, club culture, counter-culture, etc. Even though the representatives of this cultural field would rarely define themselves with this commonly used term of alternative culture, it is regardless of their self-perception that this determination has originated in the relationship between cultural policy and this scene, which means that its place has been defined by institutional criteria – financial, infrastructural, and

alike. Since the beginnings of the 21st century, the current term has been the “independent cultural scene,” which has mostly been created and used in public by its very agents. Thus, we will use the term “independent cultural scene” in this text.

² Sezgin Boynik. “Sretni zajedno” [Happy together], in: *Zagrebačke bilješke* [Notes from Zagreb], ed. by Minna Henriksson and Sezgin Boynik. Zagreb: Miroslav Kraljević Gallery, 2006. Source: www.g-mk.hr/program/Minna-L.-Henriksson-Zagreb%C4%8Dke-bilje%C5%A1ke/193/ [last accessed on 14 March 2010]

³ Biserka Cvjetičanin. “Kultura i civilno društvo” [Culture and Civil Society], in: *Zarez* 247/248 (2009). Source: www.zarez.hr/pages/247/zaristel.html [last accessed on 14 March 2010]

⁴ Emina Višnić. *Nezavisna kultura i nove suradničke prakse u Hrvatskoj, Kulturne politike odozdo* [Independent culture and new collaboration practices in Croatia]. Amsterdam, Bucharest, and Zagreb: ECUMEST Association, European Cultural Foundation, and Clubture Network, 2008, p. 31: “*Zagreb – Cultural Kapital of Europe 3000* is a collaboration platform created as a joint project of Centre for Drama Arts – CDU, Multimedia Institute – mi2, Platform 9,81, and the Association for Visual Culture Who, How, and for Whom – WHW, later joined by BLOK, Kontejner, Shadow Casters, and Community Art. The project was launched together with the German partner 'relations' and supported by the German State Foundation for Culture and the Programme for Art and the Civil Society of the Erste Bank Group in Central Europe 'Contact'.”

⁵ According to Dragojević, “this crisis primarily meant questioning and redefining the role of public cultural institutions, with an ever growing emphasis on regional development, whereby reaching for the Anglo-Saxon model of ‘cultural management’ was considered a ‘salvific solution’.” – Ibid., p. 34.

⁶ Manuel Castells. *The Rise of the Network Society, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. I*. Cambridge, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1996, 2nd ed. 2000.

⁷ Note 4, p. 34.

prostorom, ali i potrebe zagrebačke publike koja je vapila za otvaranjem prostora koji će sustavno nuditi suvremenu kulturnu i umjetničku produkciju.

²⁴ Bilj. 4, 55.

²⁵ Bilj. 4, 56: „Isprovocirani reklamnom kampanjom jedne tradicionalne kulturne manifestacije koja promovira mlade umjetnike (Salon mladih), a u sklopu koje je cijeli grad bio oblijepljen velikim plakatima sa slikom gradonačelnika (koji u svom mandatu nije napravio apsolutno ništa za pitanje mladih i nezavisne kulture), i to na gradskim oglasnim mjestima, organizirana je tajna noćna akcija preljepljivanja tih plakata, odnosno križanja gradonačelnikova lika. Inicijativa tada izlazi u javnost s imenom Pravo na grad te iznosi oštru kritiku na račun neučinkovitosti gradske uprave i lažnih obećanja čelnih ljudi grada.“ – Inicijativu Pravo na grad pokrenuli su Zagreb – Kulturni kapital Evrope 3000, Mreža mladih Hrvatske, Savez udruga Klubtura, Udruženje za razvoj kulture, Autonomni kulturni centar i Multimedijalni institut. Više na: www.pravonagrad.org [13. travanj 2009.]

²⁶ Bilj. 22, 26.

²⁷ Isto, 27.

⁸ Katrin Klingan and Ines Kappert (eds.). *Leap into the City*. Cologne: DuMont Literatur und Kunst Verlag, 2006, p. 397.

⁹ Zrinjka Peruško (ed.). *Mediji, kultura i civilno društvo* [Media, Culture, and Civil Society]. Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk, 2008, p. 107.

¹⁰ Ibidem.

¹¹ Anthony Giddens. *The Third Way. The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity, 1998, p. 37.

¹² Michel de Certeau. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1998, 54.

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ Note 4, p. 47.

¹⁵ Note 4, p. 48.

¹⁶ Laura Šakaja. *Kultura i prostor, Prostorna organizacija kulturnih djelatnosti u Hrvatskoj* [Culture and space: Spatial organization of cultural activities in Croatia]. Zagreb: Croatian University Publishers, 1999, p. 10.

¹⁷ The results of an investigation published by Mark Sančanin, “Centralni zagrebački kulturni klaster: logika prostornog razvoja culture” [Central cultural cluster in Zagreb: The logic of spatial development of culture] (published in: Sanjin Dragojević and Tihomir Žiljak (eds.), *Organizacijski razvoj i strateško planiranje u kulturi: Grad Zagreb* [Organizational development and strategic planning in culture: The City of Zagreb], 2008, pp. 262–278), do not encourage any new interpretation.

¹⁸ The Invisible Zagreb project was launched in 2003 by Platform 9,81 with the aim of achieving that various urban spaces (such as factories, subways, tunnels, etc.) that have lost their primary function, neglected by the urban policies, should become spaces for experimentation with the new typologies of public space. The basic idea of the project was to use these neglected spaces temporarily, through various cultural programmes, in order to bridge the gap in the transition process and to encourage the visions of development with respect to the specificity of each particular locality.

¹⁹ Note 4, p. 28: “POLICY_FORUM is a platform that brings together prominent organizations and individuals active in the field of

independent culture and/or interested in creating new models for developing cultural policies. POLICY_FORUM is an informal, dynamic, ‘floating’ platform. It functions as a group that meets sporadically in order to monitor public policies that are relevant for the development of independent culture on the national and local level, and endorses change in the relevant institutional framework, both in implementation practices and in legislation. The group assembled in POLICY_FORUM is changeable in its number and structure, as well as the current topics it deals with, which is why it also relates to various subjects (the Clubture network, collaboration platform Zagreb – Cultural Kapital of Europe 3000, Right to the City initiative, various organizations, etc.), or rather ‘floats’ between them.”

²⁰ Note 4, p. 19: “Clubture is a non-profit, inclusive, participative network of organizations, engaged in strengthening the independent cultural sector through the correlation of programmes, increasing the public visibility, promoting the sector’s organizational development, and increasing its impact on the change of the institutional framework in which it is active.”

²¹ Note 4, p. 48.

²² Henri Lefebvre. “The Right to the City,” in: Henri Lefebvre. *Writings on Cities*. Transl. and ed. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton, Victoria, 1996, p. 147.

²³ *Operation: City* was a result of collaboration of most independent organizations in Zagreb (27 of them participated in creating the events), with an aim of showing the needs of these organizations regarding space, as well as the need of Zagreb audiences, who were desperate for having a place with a regular offer of cultural and artistic production.

²⁴ Note 4, p. 55.

²⁵ Note 4, p. 56: “Provoked through the advertising campaign of a traditional cultural manifestation that promotes young artists (The Youth Salon), which covered the city with large-format posters showing the mayor (who has done nothing whatsoever in his mandate for young people or for independent culture) on the municipal advertising sites, a secret night action was organized, in which there posters were covered

TAKTIČKE
PRAKSE U
PRISTUPIMA
LOKALNIM
KULTURNIM
POLITIKAMA
U ZAGREBU

TACTICAL
PRACTICES IN
APPROACHING
LOCAL CULTURAL
POLICIES IN
ZAGREB

or the mayor's image was crossed out. The initiative then went public under the name of Right to the City, sharply criticising the inefficiency of the municipal administration and the false promises of the city's leading men." – The initiative was launched by Zagreb – Cultural Capital of Europe 3000, Croatian Youth Network, Network Clubture, Culture Development Association, Autonomous Cultural Centre, and Multimedia Institute. More information at: www.pravonagrad.org [last accessed on 13 April 2009].

²⁶ Note 22, p. 155.

²⁷ Note 22, p. 147 and 157.